

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 34663

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2008 Unpublished Opinion No. 635
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: September 9, 2008
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
DOUGLAS D. AIRHART, JR.,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the First Judicial District, State of Idaho, Kootenai County. Hon. John P. Luster, District Judge.

Order denying Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion for reduction of sentence, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Elizabeth A. Allred, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

PER CURIAM

Douglas D. Airhart, Jr. was convicted of possession of methamphetamine, Idaho Code section 37-2732(c). The district court imposed a unified seven-year sentence with a two-year determinate term and retained jurisdiction. At the conclusion of the retained jurisdiction program, the court relinquished jurisdiction and ordered execution of Airhart's sentence. Airhart filed an Idaho Criminal Rule 35 motion, which the district court denied. Airhart appeals from the denial of his Rule 35 motion.

A Rule 35 motion is a request for leniency which is addressed to the sound discretion of the sentencing court. *State v. Knighton*, 143 Idaho 318, 319, 144 P.3d 23, 24 (2006); *State v. Allbee*, 115 Idaho 845, 846, 771 P.2d 66, 67 (Ct. App. 1989). In presenting a Rule 35 motion, the defendant must show that the sentence is excessive in light of new or additional information subsequently provided to the district court in support of the motion. *State v. Huffman*, 144 Idaho

201, 159 P.3d 838 (2007). Our focus on review is upon the nature of the offense and the character of the offender. *State v. Reinke*, 103 Idaho 771, 772, 653 P.2d 1183, 1184 (Ct. App. 1982). Where a sentence is not illegal, the appellant must show that it is unreasonably harsh in light of the primary objective of protecting society and the related goals of deterrence, rehabilitation and retribution. *State v. Broadhead*, 120 Idaho 141, 145, 814 P.2d 401, 405 (1991), *overruled on other grounds by State v. Brown*, 121 Idaho 385, 825 P.2d 482 (1992); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982).

Having reviewed the record, including the new information submitted with Airhart's Rule 35 motion, we find no abuse of discretion in the district court's denial of the motion. Accordingly, the district court's order denying Airhart's I.C.R. 35 motion is affirmed.